

LANGUAGE POLICY, LANGUAGE PLANNING OR LANGUAGE EDITING

Zoran Nikolovski, PhD

Faculty of Economics-Prilep
University "Sv. Kliment Ohridski" Bitola
zorannikolovski@uklo.edu.mk

Abstract

In this paper we show the attitudes of several linguists (Haugen, Calvet, Cooper, Dubois, Fishman, Crystal, Corbeil etc.) that thoroughly examine the terms *language policy*, *language planning* and *language editing* give a strong contribution to the elaboration of the language problem. In determining the above terms is crucial to describe several other, implicit, which are part of the above idea and you and, more broadly defined as are *corpus planning* and *status planning*. So this paper will try to clarify the relations between them and to contribute to their determination.

Keywords: language policy, language planning, language editing

INTRODUCTION

The terms *language policy* and *language planning* used since 1959 in the article of the American linguist Haugen¹ dedicated to the language situation in Norway. This date may be considered historic because it was the first time it marked a linguistic phenomenon which was previously present, but not theoretically elaborate not even slightly. The French linguist Calvet² believes

¹ E. Haugen, "Planning for a Standard Language in Modern Norway", in *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1, 3, 1959.

² L. - J. Calvet, *La guerre des langues et les politiques linguistiques*, Paris, 1999, 154.

that this new scientific discipline is simultaneously a branch of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics.

The term *language policy* has been formalized recently; history has seen many interventions on the languages of the world as a result of the hispanisation in South America, the imposition of the French language and the stifling of the regional talks in the schools in France³, a major reform of the Turkish language made by Ataturk⁴, the sequence of reforms of the Norwegian language, the standardization of the Macedonian language in 1945⁵ and many other instances.

LANGUAGE POLICY VS LANGUAGE PLANNING

During the implementation of language interventions can distinguish three phases: the thinking phase about a language problem or a situation analysis, the phase decision and the phase of the application of that decision. The determination of the stages of language and intervention is made to clarify largely the terms *language policy* and *language planning* whose distinction is often blurred, poorly defined or declared as for synonyms.

Cooper⁶ distinguishes three approaches in the preparation of language policies: language policy as managing the innovation, language policy as marketing activities and policies as language decision.

When selecting one of these policies, it defines seven stages:

1. Highlights of the problem
2. Looking for accurate information about the problem
3. Making basic principles when deciding
4. Proposing possible solutions
5. Selecting a particular solution
6. Application of the solution
7. Comparison of predicted and actual decisions

³ Décret du 5 brumaire an II-26 octobre 1792, art. 7.

⁴ L. Bazin, « La réforme linguistique en Turquie », In *La réforme des langues, histoire et avenir*, tome 1, Buske Verlag, Hamburg, 1966.

⁵ С. Ристески, *Создавањето на современиот македонски литературен јазик*, Студентски збор, Скопје, 1988.

⁶ R. Cooper, *Language Planning and Social Change*, Cambridge University Press, New York, of 1989.

There is continuity and connectivity of all stages. The first stage is crucial for solving the problem, and the second is a long and expensive process that few communities or institutions cannot fully commit. Therefore, decisions are often made based on some information.

According to Calvet⁷, *language policy* presents a set of conscious decisions taken in the relationship between language and social life, especially between language and national life, and language planning request and use the funds necessary for the implementation of language policy. This definition can be illustrated with the example of hispanisation of the Indians of South America. The decision of Charles V is *language policy* while the application so that the language policy of this territory represents *language planning*. Based on the definition of Calvet, *language policy* related with state and no decision is theoretical but determining the factual state.

It's possible for a *language policy* to surpass the limits of a country or it can refer to a particular minority within a state which coexists alongside other communities. An example for the first case, the crossing of boundaries, would be relations of a country with its cross-border communities with the Diaspora or, with associations who learn its language. As an example of the latter case, limiting the group or smaller community of the state, we provide linguistic minorities within states that have specific platform for promotion of specific language requiring funds for implementation. However, there are many linguistic minorities who are unable themselves to realize their language policies.

The term *language planning* in itself contains the term *language policy* while the opposite case, the second to contain the first term is relative here could indicate a number of policy decisions in terms of the language that has never been applied for not having enough power by the decision maker.

The language policy could have *practical* and *symbolic function*.

The practical function is executed when the newly created state decides a local language or dialect to become the national language followed by *language planning* which is introduced in all areas of social life (schools, administration, etc.), until it has been replaced with the official or colonial language.

The symbolic function is being realized when the decisions of a certain state is not being immediately applied or not applied ever. Such is the case when the Nationalist Party of Indonesia in 1928 decided to promote the national

⁷ L. - J. Calvet, *op. cit.*, 154-155.

Malay language at a time when that country was under the colonial rule of the Netherlands, but the party has no assets or opportunities to realize that decision. Confirming Malay as the national language symbolically confirmed the existence of the Indonesian nation which needed a period of 20 years and independence of the country for that decision to be applied and, therefore, to perform a practical function.

In the vocabulary of Jean Dubois and his associates⁸ the term *language policy* explains how the set of measures, plans or strategies aimed at regulating status and the form of one or more languages. According to the dictionary, *language policy* can exist without *language planning*. The term *language planning* in it can be explained as a set of measures prescribed by the state of standardization of a language and regulation its use. According to this dictionary, *language planning* itself can be a *language policy* or just be a part of it.

In Quebec, the term *language policy* has an immediate importance and a means for determining the status of a language clearly expressed through a formal text that clearly specifies how the realization of that status. The application of the law in this area is one of many strategies in determining the status of a language.

For Louis Porcher⁹ *language policy* is voluntarily-acquired action in a country, entity or group whose goal is to protect and develop their language and culture. Such action includes awareness of goals, means and further steps of action. *Language policy* involves first making the policy decisions, and even after that happens, its accession to the technical realization is being conducted. Once goals are being defined, the first decision which consists of determining the priority tasks is being adopted, sort them and determine the modalities for the operation to be deployed for a shorter or longer period. There is no long-term *language policy* without determining the long-term goals because of their dependence on short-term goals and objectives. However, in reality often the contrary happens.

⁸ Jean Dubois et al, *Dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage*, Paris, 1994.

⁹ Louis Porcher, « Les politiques linguistiques », in *Les cahiers de l'ASDIFLE*, N ° 7, Paris, 1995.

Language policy is not conducted in an isolated way, but pursued through partnerships with other entities. Partnership is a central concept because it is taken for the overall development and implementation of activities.

We should not accept the conception of *language policy*, sometimes understood by individuals as policy learning language. Certainly, education has received a special place in applying the *language policy*, but there are other areas where it can be applied (mass media, culture, business life, science and technology, public service, science, etc.).

The term *language policy* appeared in a short time and expanded in several languages, in English by Fishman¹⁰, in Spanish by Rafael Ninyoles¹¹, in German by Helmut Glück¹² writes about it, and over time this concept has been related to many other languages. And in all his clarification and specification there is a quite clear view that there is a relationship of subordination between *language policy* and *language planning*. *Language planning* application is already established as *language policy*.

LINGUISTIC PLANNING AGAINST LANGUAGE EDITING

It is possible for the same or similar language situations in different countries to emerge and different terms, like *language editing* in Quebec or *linguistic standardization* in Catalonia with its features and the importance of varying importance.

Pierre-Etienne Laporte¹³ points out that in Canada, in Quebec, i.e., the term *language editing* (*aménagement linguistique*) has encompassed all activities aimed to determine the definite status of one or more languages or to make it fit for use in certain areas or for certain functions that previously lacked

¹⁰ Joshua Fishman, *Sociolinguistics: a brief introduction*, Newbury House, Rowley, Mass, 1970.

¹¹ Rafael Ninyoles, *Estructura social y política lingüística*, Valence, Fernando Torres Editor, 1975.

¹² Helmut Glück, *Sprachtheorie und Sprach (en) politik*, Osnabrück, 1981.

¹³ Pierre-Etienne Laporte, « Les mots-clés du discours politique en aménagement linguistique au Québec et au Canada », In TRUCHOT, Claude et al, *Le plurilinguisme européen*, Champion, Collection "Politique linguistique", Paris, 1994.

so use the term *language editing* in this country, avoid the connotation that the term *language planning* (*planification linguistique*) referring to planned intervention by the state. In this case, it is a substantial difference, but for synonyms.

Daoust and Maurais¹⁴ note that the term *language planning* refers to more state intervention, directing, and the concept *language editing* is based on social consensus on a collective linguistic project. They also elaborate the term *standardization* (*normalisation*) which assumes the existence of a situation which is not being adjusted to the need to adjust and normalize the historical development.

According to David Crystal¹⁵ the term *language planning*, involves a deliberate, systematic and theoretically well-founded attempt to solve the communication problems of a particular community through the study of different languages or dialects that exist in it and the formation of official *language policy* that would be related to their selection and use of *language engineering*. He also describes the term *corpus planning* which means selection and codification of the norm by compiling grammars and standardization of the spelling conventions. *Status planning* deals with the initial choice of language involves certain attitudes about alternative languages as well as political implications of the respective choosing. In this dictionary, Crystal advised to consider the chapter *sociolinguistic* and comes under the titular *language policy*, which refers to *language planning*.

Corbeil¹⁶ reveals the fallacy of some politicians who have *language editing* who equal it often as a technical regulation of the use of language in the education system, thereby reducing off and symbolic aspects of language and the nature of his social function. Corbeil, in order for it to be more effective, thought that *language editing* should have a global concept and needs to be performed in phases for greater efficiency.

¹⁴ Denise & Pierre Daoust Maurais, « L'aménagement linguistique », in *Politique et aménagement linguistique*, Le Robert, Paris, 1987.

¹⁵ David Crystal, *an Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1992.

¹⁶ Jean-Claude Corbeil, « Communication », In *Actes du Colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique*, Les Presses de l'Université Laval, Québec, 1987.

Roland Breton also talks about *language editing* who states that it can be *external* and *internal*. *External language editing* includes language legislation and its purpose is to promote the language or languages and their use in certain social spheres (education, mass media, administration, etc.). *Internal language editing*, according to its standards, includes the segregation of certain language in order for it to become competitive and autonomous. *Internal language editing* is synonymous to *language engineering* that gives results evident in many other countries in the world (Israel, India, Indonesia), which proves that a country can act very effectively in this area.

Heinz Kloss proposes a typology which refers to the aspect of language that is the target of intervention. He proposed the term *corpus planning* which means editing the language, i.e., it is a case where a person, organization or group of people have to change the form and nature of language by proposing and imposing new terms change the spelling etc. He also speaks about the *status planning* when one is intervening to regulate the social status of language over other languages in or out of the country where it is spoken.

CONCLUSION

Although the language is as old as politics and relations between languages and societies, even in the 60's and 70's of the 20th century elaborate concepts first *language policy* and define their methods with their studies arise from the observation of actions so that the language in many countries worldwide.

Language policy is a set of conscious decisions taken in the relationship between language and social life, especially between language and national life (Calvet), then, a set of measures, plans or strategies aimed at regulating the status and the form of one or more languages (Dubois) or the term voluntary action by a particular country, entity or group whose goal is to protect and develop their language and culture (Porcher). In Quebec, it is also a means of determining the status of a language clearly expressed through a formal text that explicitly specifies how that particular status is realized.

Language editing encompasses activities that you have to order before a certain detachment status of a particular language or its use for training in specific areas or for specific functions (Quebec). It refers to the role that national languages have in the school system and for it to be effective; there should be a global concept and exercise phases (Corbeil). According to Breton *language*

editing can be *external* (when the legislation includes language legislation and its purpose is to promote the languages and their use in certain social areas (education, mass media, administration, etc.) and *internally* (using the standardization of certain language i.e. *language engineering*).

Language planning is a requirement and use of resources is necessary for the implementation of *language policy* (Calvet), then deliberate, systematic and theoretically well-founded attempt to solve the communication problems of a particular community through the study of languages or dialects that you are in it and forming the official *language policy* that would be related to their selection and application of *linguistic engineering* (Crystal). In Quebec the term *language editing* is more preferable in respect to the term *language planning* and thus the connotation of intervention planned by the state is being avoided.

REFERENCES

- Calvet Louis-Jean, *La guerre des langues et les politiques linguistiques*, Hachette Littératures, Paris, 1999.
- Calvet Louis-Jean, *Pour une écologie des langues du monde*, Plon, Paris, 1999.
- Cooper Robert, *Language Planning and Social Change*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1989.
- Corbeil Jean-Claude, *Communication*, in *Actes du Colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique*, Les Presses de l'Université Laval, Québec, 1987.
- Crystal David, *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1992.
- Daoust Denise & Maurais Pierre, « L'aménagement linguistique », in *Politique et aménagement linguistique*, Le Robert, Paris, 1987.
- Das Gupta, J. & Ferguson, C., "Problems of Language Planning", in *Language Planning Processes*, Mouton, La Haye, 1977.
- Dubois Jean et alii, *Dictionnaire de linguistique*, Larousse-Bordas/HER, Paris, 2001.
- Ferguson Charles, *Sociolinguistics perspectives, Papers on Language in Society 1959-1994*, Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Haugen Einar, *Language Conflict and Language Planning, the Case of Modern Norwegian*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Leclerc Jacques, *L'aménagement linguistique dans le monde*
<<http://www.axl.cefanelaval.ca/>>

Ристески Стојан, *Создавањето на современиот македонски литературен јазик*, Студентски збор, Скопје, 1988.

Rousseau Louis-Jean, *Élaboration et mise en œuvre des politiques linguistiques*, <<http://www.rifal.org/cahiers/rifal26/crf-26-06.pdf>>

Saint Robert Marie-Josée de, *La politique de la langue française*, Presse Universitaire de France, Que sais-je?, Paris, 2000.